

Remarks

In the present response, three claims (1, 11, 20) are amended; and three claims (21-23) are added. No new matter is added. Claims 1-23 are presented for examination.

I. Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 6,631,346 (hereinafter Karaorman). This rejection is traversed.

A proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that a single prior art reference disclose each element of the claim. See MPEP § 2131, also, *W.L. Gore & Assoc., Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Since Karaorman neither teaches nor suggests each element in claims 1-20, these claims are allowable over Karaorman.

Each independent claim 1, 11, and 20 is amended to include the recitation that **a single meaning token has a same meaning associated with plural different spoken words that have different pronunciations but similar spoken meanings such that different spoken inputs having different spoken words but similar spoken meanings are converted into a same meaning token or same sequence of meaning tokens.**

Applicant submits that Karaorman does not teach or suggest this recitation.

Karaorman teaches: "A speaker utters a phrase that is recognized by an automatic speech recognizer 117 which generates input sentence 118. Lexical analysis stage 119 identifies and generates tags for the topics ... in input sentence 118." (Col. 5, lines 51-55, text omitted). However, Karaorman then proceeds to teach away from the recitations of claims 1, 11, and 20. Karaorman states:

The present invention is preferably as "aggressive" as possible in spotting each topic **resulting in the generation of multiple tag candidates**. Additionally in the presence of numbers or certain key-words, such as "between", "before", "and", "or", "around", etc., and especially if these words have been introduced or dropped due to recognition errors **it is possible to construct many alternative tag candidates.** (Col. 6, lines 51-58: Bold added).

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of independent claims 1, 11, and 20. The dependent claims, depending from these independent claims, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Additionally, Applicant added new claims 20-23. Karaorman does not teach or suggest the limitations in these claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant believes claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. (281) 514-8236, Facsimile No. (281) 514-8332. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,



Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 281-514-8236

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 18th day of October, 2004.

By Be Henry
Name: Be Henry